

Socio-Cultural Foundations of the Psychological Analysis of Ethnic Identity: A View from the Outside and from the Inside

Alexander F Bondarenko*

Department of Psychology, Kyiv National Linguistic University, Ukraine

***Corresponding Author:** Alexander F Bondarenko, Department of Psychology, Kyiv National Linguistic University, Ukraine.

Received: May 01, 2021; **Published:** May 31, 2021

Issues of Ethnopsychology since the emergence of the extensive "Psychology of Nations" by W. Wundt have in one way or another attracted and are attracting attention for at least the last one and a half centuries. In the spectrum of this problem, the following traditional directions can be distinguished: firstly, ethnographic and anthropological, adjacent to it (B. de Sahaguna, N.N. Miklukho-Maclay, E. Taylor, N.N. Kharuzin, J. Fraser, L. Morgan, F. Ratzel, E. Durkheim, F. Boas, Yu.V. Bromley, S.A. Tokarev and others); secondly, psychoanalytic (Z. Freud, K. Jung, M. Eliade, J. Lacan, G. Roheim and others); thirdly, structuralist (B. Malinovsky, E. Evans-Pritchard, K. Levi-Strauss, L. Levy-Bruhl, and others).

However, the psychological aspect itself, or rather even the socio-cultural foundations of the psychological specifics of the ethnos, this extremely interesting and important approach, which owes its origin to a number of domestic and foreign culturologists and psychologists (N. Ya. Danilevsky, I.A. Sikorsky, N.O. Lossky, M. Mead, D. Freeman, G. Bayson and others), in the line of which A. Toynbee and S. Hattington thought, due to their special significance not so much for understanding and interpreting primitive cultures, as for taking into account real, and not contrived features life of modern society in the conditions of industrial and post-industrial society, and would remain the prey of a host of political scientists, if it were not for the movement of modern indigenous psychology and psychotherapy that has gained significant strength in a number of countries (Canada, Russia, Poland, USA, China, Philippines, Japan), which is associated with the perdition of the notorious Eurocentrism in general and the mythology of psychoanalysis in particular (A.F. Bondarenko, A.V. Sukharev V. Enriques, W. Kim, K. Young, K. Hwam, S. Allwood, R. Ardilla J. Henrich, J. Kats, S. Okasaka, A. Vezhbitska and others) [1,2].

The specificity of this particular approach is that for the first time it overcomes the external, traditionally object approach to the psychological ontology of the ethnos and makes efforts to ecologically reconstruct the internal structure of the sociocultural system, which determines the mental structure of the ethnos and its psychological originality. It is this approach, free from ideological contrivedness and naive attempts to impose the value-semantic scales of another on the system of value meanings of one culture, that open up fundamentally new opportunities for understanding and explaining both the systemic and structural foundations and the probabilistic paths of development of a given culture, if, of course, the task of destroying it has not been set, which makes these studies meaningless. However, the very fact of the emergence of such a powerful current in a number of leading countries of the world clearly indicates that the stubborn striving of usurious-oligarchic groupings to totalitarianization of the Earth's population, disguised at first by the term "communism", and then, after discrediting this idea, by the term "globalism" Meets with ever more powerful resistance from that layer of the noosphere, which is capable of intellectual efforts, not only within the interests of its own group or clan.

As we have already emphasized earlier, high Russian culture is characterized precisely by the striving for moral improvement. While, say, Jewish - by the desire to improve the intellectual. At least, this is exactly what Moses Maimonides (Rambam), revered by the Jews as the second Moses, wrote back in the XII century ([7], p. 499). The Russian person is not the bearer of the Protestant norm of permissiveness, not the Jewish norm of prohibition, not the Islamic norm of obedience, but the Eastern Christian norm of blessed action, action sanctioned from the position of absolute good, absolute good.

It is thanks to the absolute significance of the ethical principle in Russian psychology that the consequences of the fateful events of the twentieth century in the popular mind were reinterpreted from the intellectual-Marxist, that is, schizoid-inhuman (as I remember, "Woe from Wit" is precisely the Russian classics) into the interpretation of what is happening as a huge sacrifice for a brighter future. The disclosure of a value-semantic conflict, which, as a rule, is based on experiences associated either with voluntary self-sacrifice, or with the understanding of sacrifice by others in relation to yourself, which, in fact, causes an ethical conflict, and is the core of Russian psychology and Russian ethical personalism.

The Russian person is not at all as irrational as is commonly believed in artificially supported myths. The undoubted danger for the Russian consciousness is represented by the values of personal benefit and success imposed on us, adopted in the commercialized logic of atonement for sins alien to us by buying indulgences or achieving God-pleasing thanks to our own material well-being.

Further, the archetypal feature of the Russian mentality is, most likely, contemplation, not practicality, since the categories of activity, power and independence are combined into a single construct with the value of knowledge.

Finally, for Russians, it is love that represents the absolute and highest moral value. And freedom, in the words of A. A. Ukhtomsky, is given only where there are gifts of the Holy Spirit. While, for example, in the popularized today noachism with its attempts to introduce "universal ethics", according to the profound remark of O. N. Chetverikova, "there is faith in one God for all (while everyone has his own understanding of it), there are prohibitions, there is a judgment, but there is no Christian commandment of love that reveals a person's personality" [6, p. 216]. At the same time, the essence of man in the Russian understanding is divine, i.e. the highest conceivable entity is duty. It is these irreducible socio-cultural properties of the Russian person that are the true content and subject of domestic traditions and perspectives in non-medical psychotherapy [3]. Another thing is that high Russian culture in the twentieth century was destroyed. Russian people quite often feel like spiritual orphans. In connection with the infection with rudeness, this imaginary spiritual panacea of the plebs, the return of the primordial self-esteem to the Russian person, the awakening of which heals the human soul, is the most healing potion. Unfortunately, only an extreme, borderline situation is a necessary condition for this awakening. It is in an extreme, borderline situation, on the anthropological border of the human and the non-human, that Russian psychology opposes the Western transgression, in which, in the words of S. S. Horuzhego, "crime as such is elevated to a fundamental anthropological attitude" [5].

It is important to consider the origins of these mental characteristics of Russians. The fact is that it is Ancient Persia, its culture, captured in the book of the prophet Zoroaster called "Avesta", a book in which the epiphany that God does not need sacrifices, a book that was solemnly burned by Alexander the Great, by this the product of a barbarian slave-owning society that conquered a country in which slavery was already prohibited, and whose spiritual representatives - Balthazar, Gaspar and Melchior - presented their gifts to the baby Jesus, foreseeing that it was this son of man who was called by God to complete the stage of sacrifice with his ascent to the cross in the life of peoples, bringing into the world the light of Christianity, the only religion of mercy, under the influence of which Theodosius the Great, the emperor of Byzantium, under the threat of death, introduced in 381-385 A.D. a ban on any sacrifice. Without understanding this most important mental education in Russian culture, it is impossible to understand either the prohibition on the death penalty introduced by Catherine the Great back in 1744, or why in Russia the position of executioner was despised, in contrast to Western Europe, where it was considered honorable and was inherited, neither the patience and gentleness of the Russians, nor their merciful attitude towards defeated enemies, nor categorical understanding of Good and Evil, in contrast to the moral relativism of Protestants and the well-known principle of the talion "an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth" from the Torah.

The comprehension of one's own belonging to the native culture and the methods of action arising from this culture seem to us to be the primary task of professional education and training of Russian practicing psychologists. Suffice it to note that the most inhuman century in history, namely the twentieth century, became such, not least because of the aggressive encroachment of certain states and groups of people on the values and traditions of precisely Eastern, Byzantine Christianity with its ideals of mercy and love, service and unselfishness, free forgiveness and repentance.

However, the widespread cultural crisis that arose in the late 19th - early 20th centuries, at first vaguely anticipated by F. Nietzsche and A. Schopenhauer, and then acutely realized by N. Ya. Danilevsky, K.N. Leontiev, O. Spengler, G. Simmel, Jaspers, V.A. Soloviev, V.V. Rozanov, S.L. Frank and others, despite various attempts to explain it from the standpoint of various philosophical and psychological schools (from Marxism and psychoanalysis to motley and variegated figures of existentialists), in addition to the fact that it ultimately led to the primitivization and marginalization of the psyche the human population has not been resolved until now, since neither its true causes, nor the means of overcoming it are not only not reflected, but, even if they are realized, can not be accepted as such. Instead, a mental chewing gum of Freudian-Marxist fabrications, diluted with a fair amount of existentialist ambiguities, which rather confuse the subject rather than explain it, but at least clarify it, is offered.

In this regard, the studies of A.V. Sukharev are extremely interesting, whose view of the problems of both cross-cultural and indigenous psychology seems to us not only original, but important and valuable. As A.A. Sukharev notes, the research refutes the so-called hypothesis of "cognitive unity of mankind". The author points out: even "such a widespread psychopathological condition as "generalization of the feeling of hopelessness"... has a different meaning... for a Protestant American, a Sri Lankan Buddhist and an Orthodox Russian. For the American, this feeling is an annoying obstacle to work, to achieving success in life (which is a virtue in the system of Protestant values), which psychiatrists and certified psychologists can eliminate. An Orthodox Russian, along with the fact that he can also go to a doctor and a psychotherapist, will take on part of the responsibility for this, in fact, a sinful feeling of despondency. A Buddhist, having experienced this state in adulthood, will perceive it as a starting point for "enlightenment" ([4], p. 210).

That is why reasoning about the human psyche outside the analysis of the context of its sociocultural foundations, as well as attempts to apply an allegedly "universal psychotherapeutic approach" to the bearer of a certain ethnically and socio-culturally determined personality, is meaningless. This is what explains the obvious failures of psychoanalysis, which are obvious to everyone, except for ardent apologists, in the mainstream of which no one has yet been cured over the past hundred-odd years. That is why it is methodologically incorrect to compare different populations from the standpoint of a certain absolutist point of view, since upon closer examination it turns out to be attitudinal deterministic.

It is in such attempts that we come across what A.V. Sukharev calls "ethnofunctional mismatch" of the psyche - relations, states, processes. Violation of the socio-cultural foundations of ethnofunctional development is manifested in the following features: 1. Ethnofunctional mismatch in the content of the stages of ontogeny, when, as a result of a mismatch between the environment and the native culture, a child born, say, in the upper reaches of the Dnieper, lives with the mythological ideas of the peoples of South America; 2. Loss of one or another stage, when in ontogeny the child is deprived of the fabulous-mythological stage and immediately proceeds to the imperative of "obligation" (Recall N.K. Krupskaya's ban from 1920 on the publication of children's stories); 3. Violation of the sequence of stages of mental ontogenesis, when, say, instead of the religious and ethical stage of raising a child, he is offered computer "shooters" (See [4], p. 212).

That is why it makes no sense to compare the socio-culturally determined features of modern civilizational formations for the reason that in an era of cultural crisis and the forcing of the idea of nomadic existence of not just people, but entire populations, at best we are dealing with violations of the integral culture of society, and at worst - with artificial protrusion of either ethnographic or simply atavistic signs of pseudoculture, designed to emphasize the imaginary originality of this society. In other words, outside and in addition to a thorough analysis of religious, landscape-climatic, cultural, everyday, mass media, linguistic and ideological influences, an adequate analysis of the essence of the mental differences between representatives of different ethnic groups will be just another repetition of

Bibliography

1. Bondarenko AF. "Ethical basis of psychotherapeutic practices dating back to the anthropology of Eastern Christianity". *Psychological Counseling and Psychotherapy* 2.6 (2016): 6-17.
2. Bondarenko AF. "Language, Culture, Psychotherapy". Kiev, Department (2012): 364.
3. Venger AB. "Psychotherapy: Western Theory and Russian Practice". *Moscow Psychotherapeutic Journal* 1 (2004): 5-17. 3
4. AV Sukharev. "Cultural and psychological foundations of ethnofunctional psychotherapy". *Humanitarian Research* 1 (2007): s204-s228.
5. Horuzhy S. "The modern anthropological situation in the light of synergistic anthropology".
6. Chetverikova ON. Treason in the Vatican, or a conspiracy of popes against Christianity), Moscow: EKSMO, 211-240s.
7. Yalom I. "Jekzistencial'naja psihoterapija". M: Rimis (2008): 576.

Volume 10 Issue 6 June 2021

©All rights reserved by Alexander F Bondarenko.